



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

31 to August 25. They varied in length from 17 to 24 cm. with a modal length of 19 cm., were all mature, and in their spawning season. No variation of food in correlation to sex or condition could be established. The accompanying data indicates the material found and the number of stomachs found containing each particular food:

Material, Small crabs; no. of stomachs, 17. Shrimps; 1. Unidentified crustaceans; 1. Mussels; 5. Unidentified; 1. Empty; 32.

The unidentified material consisted largely of matter reduced to a blue or yellowish paste presumably by the process of digestion.

C. M. BREDER, JR.,
U. S. Bureau of Fisheries.

CORYTHOICHTHYS ENSENADAE FROM BERMUDA.

Two specimens of an unrecognized pipefish were collected at Hungry Bay, November 5, 1906, which appear to be *Corythoichthys ensenadae* (Silvester). May and June, 1915. Porto Rico. Vol. XII, Marine Biol. Carnegie Inst. p. 21, Pl. 2.

The following is a detailed description of them. Head 4 in trunk, $10\frac{1}{2}$ in total. Depth equal to the greatest width. Snout just over 3 in the head. Base of dorsal is $1\frac{1}{4}$ in head. Rings 17+34. Dorsal has 19 rays on 0+6 rings. Egg pouch is $3\frac{2}{3}$ in total. Color brown, upper part of snout and interorbital yellow, interorbital with a small brown dot in its center. A streak of yellow beginning at the posterior border of the orbit and running back over the nape to the other eye; base of pectoral with a yellow dot; 7 bars crossing the back to beginning of dorsal, its first ray in a brown dot which is in the 7th bar; 2 bars behind this running through the dorsal; then 5 bars; then 2 dots followed by

markings which look like KIX. There are 7 more behind the X. Belly has 15 rows of dots, having 3 dots in each row. Behind the pouch the markings are more or less met by those of the back. There are 25 bars in all on the male and 22 on the female.

L. L. MOWBRAY,
Miami Aquarium, Florida.

REVIEW OF BLANCHARD'S REVISION OF THE KING SNAKES

The American King Snakes of the genus *Lampropeltis* have always been a sharp thorn in the side of every herpetologist who has dealt with them. Five North American genera of snakes have particularly needed revision. *Thamnophis* has been reduced to order by Ruthven. Now, Blanchard of the University of Michigan, has helped us similarly with an extremely useful revision of *Lampropeltis*. *Elaphe*, *Natrix*, and *Pituophis* still await biographers, although the genus last named offers no such teasing problem as the others.

The sort of revision before me now is preëminently the American form of contribution to the literature of systematic zoölogy and one in which American workers may well take pride. Comparisons are never very well worth while and Boulenger's handling of the *Lacertidae* and of some of the sections of the genus *Rana* is masterly in the extreme. Nevertheless, Blanchard's paper, although almost the first contribution to science with which he has favored us, still stands forth as certainly as useful in its arrangement as any revision which has hereto appeared. One particular feature impressed me most happily and that is the recognition of possibly doubtful forms under distinct headings where they can not be proved definitely to be synonyms of some other type. In the past, the "lumping" of doubtful forms has brought more misery into the lives of